

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	:	Scott C. Harris	Group Art Unit 3624
Appl. No.	:	10/065,327	
Filed	:	October 3, 2002	
For	:	WEB BASED COMMUNICATION OF INFORMATION WITH RECONFIGURABLE FORMAT	
Examiner	:	T. T. Havan	

PRE APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

MAIL STOP AF
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above referenced application. No amendments are being filed with this request. However, this request is being concurrently filed with a notice of repeal.

The attached request summarizes the reasons for review in five pages or less, as required.

CERTIFICATE OF FAX TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked attachments are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below:

Date of Deposit

Signature

Typed or Printed Name of Person

Appl. No. : **10/065,327**
Filed : **October 3, 2002**

Remarks

Claims 1-18 and 41-52 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over Vlaphoplus. With all due respect, this rejection does not meet the Patent Office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability. Specifically, and as explained in detail herein, there is no showing that Vlaphoplus suggests execution of "a prestored sequence of actions based on a single actuation that interface with a remote Internet site". Moreover, there is no showing that Vlaphoplus discloses the subject matter of some of the dependent claims, such as claims 3 and others.

The rejection states that Vlaphoplus's paragraphs 195 through 208 suggest a sequence of actions based on a single actuation as claimed. However, these cited sections of Vlaphoplus simply show a user logging into the system, receiving a personalized page, and that personalized page having links and/or abilities to view or edit user information. Paragraph 195 explains that the users may select a link to view, enter or edit information. Different links are suggested. However, selection of a link would be an additional actuation in addition to the original login, and therefore, would not be a "single actuation", as claimed. Paragraph 195 defines different links for the party (84) or the commodities (86, 88, 90 or 92). However, for each of these links, the user can select the link (as an additional actuation) and add/edit information. Editing of information itself requires additional keystrokes -- and as such is not a "single actuation" as claimed. The user certainly does select the single link with a single actuation, but there is no showing that the single action executes "a prestored sequence of actions... that interface with a remote Internet website" as claimed. Vlaphoplus simply shows

Appl. No. : **10/065,327**
Filed : **October 3, 2002**

using a single web link to obtain information from a single website. Vlaphoplus does not initiate a prestored sequence of actions, responsive to a single actuation, as claimed.

Similarly, paragraph 196 of Vlaphoplus describes the user information page that allows a user to edit their information. Since the user must edit their information, it stands to reason that this is more than a single actuation, the user is editing their information and therefore by definition this is multiple actuations. Paragraph 197 allows viewing information about the attorneys, brokers, mortgage brokers or friends. Any attorney information can be selected (paragraph 198) and can be viewed or edited. Again, however, selecting and then editing is multiple actions -- not a single action as claimed. Similarly, paragraph 200 describes selecting the links 1710 to edit information for the real estate brokers. Paragraph 201 describes the selecting the link 1715 as information for mortgage brokers. Paragraph 202 describes selecting the link for editing friends. Paragraph 205 describes selecting a link for adding commodities.

All of these simply allows selection of a link, and then editing the information associated with the link. This is two separate actuations. There is no teaching or suggestion of, as claimed, selecting with a single actuation to select "execution of a prestored sequence of actions based on said single actuation that interface with a remote Internet site... and returns information from the Internet website". Quite simply, this is not suggested by Vlaphoplus. The rejection is based on hindsight, not based on the contents of Vlaphoplus.

The dependent claims should be allowable for analogous reasons. Claim 3 defines that the sequence (that is the "execution of a prestored sequence of actions based on a single action"), accesses a plurality of different websites and that the

Appl. No. : **10/065,327**
Filed : **October 3, 2002**

information (that is returned) is based on the plurality of different websites. There is no teaching or suggestion of this in Vlaploplus.

Claim 5 defines that the information includes a balance from the bank, which is obtained based on the sequence of actions. Clearly, Vlaploplus contemplates entering bank account information see for example paragraph 143. The bank account information is used to purchase commodities, for example. There is not one word in Vlaploplus about determining the balance from the bank using a prestored sequence of actions based on a single actuation, as claimed.

Claim 7 defines more about the sequence of actions, and specifically that they are carried out to navigate to a sequence of actions on the website and return a specified value. This is not taught by Vlaploplus.

Claim 9 defines that the sequence of actions is used to place a bid on an item. Vlaploplus does use the word "bid", in the sense of commodities. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of placing a bid using a single actuation to create a sequence of actions on a remote site.

Claim 10 defines a sequence of actions access a first website, and a second action on a second website using the first value to access the second website. Quite simply this is not suggested by anything in Vlaploplus.

Claim 11 defines that those actions are obtaining the bill amount from a first website, and paying that bill using a second website, which is a bank's website. Again, there is no suggestion or disclosure of doing this in Vlaploplus.

Claim 14 defines a biometric reader. No such reader is disclosed by Vlaploplus. Hence the rejection of claim 14 based on section 102 is entirely improper.

Appl. No. : **10/065,327**
Filed : **October 3, 2002**

Claims 15 and 16 relate to encryption, and neither the word "encrypt" or "encryption" is found anywhere in Vlaphoplus using a full text search. Clearly, therefore, Vlaphoplus does not identically disclose the subject matter.

Claim 41 defines a user interface that displays an indication, where a single action causes a prestored sequence of actions to be carried out over the network and a processor that executes the prestored sequence of actions over the network. As discussed above, this is nowhere taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

The dependent claims should also be allowable for analogous reasons to those discussed above, and specifically claims 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50 are simply not disclosed by Vlaphoplus.

In summary, and with all due respect to the Patent Office's position, the rejection based on section 102 is completely improper, and does not, by any stretch of the imagination, meet the Patent Office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability. Reversal of the current rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Appl. No. : **10/065,327**
Filed : **October 3, 2002**

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account
No. 50-1387.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __April 3, 2006__

_____/SCH/_____
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
P.O. Box 927649
San Diego, CA 92192
Telephone: (619) 823-7778
Facsimile: (858) 678-5082